

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in view of the following
Remarks is respectfully requested.

The applicant notes that this is a second, but Non-Final Office Action because the Examiner has identified new grounds of rejection. In the applicant's response of April 15, 2002 to the first Office Action of January 18, 2002, the applicant presented arguments to overcome the rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hiroshi, JP 4313300 A, published November 5, 1992. The applicant also presented arguments to overcome the rejection of claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitama (US 5,740,527 – issued April 14, 1998) in view of Hiroshi.

Allowable Subject Matter: Claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16 and 18

The Examiner has now identified allowable subject matter in claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16 and 18. Claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejections: Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15 and 17

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Iwane (filed July 2, 1996 – issued February 17, 1998).

The applicant notes that the basis of the rejection as being under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) appears to be in error. The present application of Hosonuma was filed in Japan on November 24, 1998 and was filed in the U.S. on November 22, 1999. Therefore, more than one year elapsed between the US filing date of Hosonuma and the US publication date of Iwane.

Claims 1, 7 and 13:

With respect to claims 1, 7 and 13, the Examiner asserts that Iwane, FIG. 2, discloses the limitations of claims 1, 7 and 13 of an internal layer and a line formed in a first area of said *internal layer*, said line radiating unnecessary radiation; *a first ground layer formed on an upper surface of said internal layer*, said first ground layer disallowing radiation to pass therethrough; *and a second ground layer formed on a lower surface of said internal layer*, said second ground layer disallowing radiation to pass therethrough.

The Examiner asserts that the internal layer of claims 1, 7 and 13 is disclosed by Iwane as formed between conductor layer 1 to 4. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that the first ground layer 3a and the second ground layer 3b of Iwane are formed on an upper and lower surface, respectively, of said internal layer, as recited by claims 1, 7 and 13. The Examiner also points to the disclosure by Iwane in column 3, lines 57-58, that the conductor layers 3a and 3b constitute ground layers.

In response, the applicant respectfully maintains that if in Iwane the internal layer is formed **between** conductor layers 1 to 4, then Iwane **cannot** disclose that a first ground layer *is formed on an upper surface* of said internal layer and a second ground layer *formed on a lower surface* of said internal layer, as recited by claims 1 and 13, **nor can Iwane disclose** *covering an upper surface of said internal layer with a first ground layer and covering a lower surface of said internal layer with a second ground layer*, as recited by claim 7.

The applicant maintains that Iwane cannot disclose the limitations of claims 1, 7 and 13 because Iwane discloses that the only ground layers are conductive layers 3a and 3b, and these are shown as sandwiched between the internal layer formed between conductor layers 1 to 4 forming the internal layer.

Therefore, claims 1, 7 and 13 patentably distinguish over Iwane. The applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13.

Claims 2, 8 and 14:

With respect to the rejection of claims 2, 8 and 14, the Examiner asserts that Iwane, FIG. 2, conductor layer 1 is now equivalent to first cover layer formed over a surface of said first ground layer, and conductor layer 2 is now equivalent to second cover layer formed over a surface of said second ground layer, as recited by claim 2.

In response, the applicant respectfully maintains as before that the only ground layers in Iwane are conductive layers 3a and 3b and these are sandwiched between the internal layer formed between conductor layer 1 to 4. Therefore, the first and second cover layers 1 and 4 cannot be formed over a surface of said first and second ground layers, as recited by claims 2, 8 and 14.

Consequently, claims 2, 8 and 14 patentably distinguish over Iwane. The applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2, 8 and 14.

Claims 3, 9 and 15:

The Examiner asserts that insulation layers 5a to 5e of Iwane, FIG. 2, are insulating layers sandwiched among said internal layer, that the that first and second ground layers 3a and 3b are analogous to first and second ground layers, and that conductor layers 1 and 4 are analogous to first and second cover layers, as recited by claims 3, 9 and 15.

In response, the applicant respectfully maintains that claims 3, 9 and 15 stand together with the arguments presented for claims 1, 7 and 13. Therefore, claims 3, 9 and 15 patentably distinguish over Iwane. The applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 9 and 15.

Claims 5, 11 and 17:

The Examiner asserts that the holes 7a to 7c connecting conducting layers 1 and 4 of Iwane, FIG. 2, and which pass through ground layers 3a and 3b and insulation layers 5a to 5e, are analogous to a plurality of through holes formed throughout said first ground layer, said internal layer, and said second ground layer, as recited by claims 5, 11 and 17.

In response, the applicant respectfully maintains that claims 5, 11 and 17 stand together with the arguments presented for claims 1, 7 and 13.

Therefore, claims 5, 11 and 17 patentably distinguish over Iwane. The applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 11 and 17.

The foregoing Remarks establish the patentable nature of all of the claims in the application, i.e., claims 1-18. No new matter has been added, wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anthony N. Fresco".

Anthony N. Fresco
Registration No.: 45,784

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343/4366 FAX

ANF:yǝ